

Magnetic-Field Generation by Randomly Forced Shearing Waves

A. A. Schekochihin,^{1,*} T. Heinemann,² N. Kleeorin,³ G. Lesur,²
A. Mallet,⁴ J. C. McWilliams,⁵ I. Rogachevskii,³ and T. A. Yousef¹

¹*Plasma Physics Group, Blackett Laboratory, Imperial College, London SW7 2AZ, United Kingdom*

²*DAMTP, University of Cambridge, Cambridge CB3 0WA, United Kingdom*

³*Department of Mechanical Engineering, The Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, Beer-Sheva 84105, Israel*

⁴*Selwyn College, Cambridge CB3 9DQ, United Kingdom*

⁵*Department of Atmospheric Sciences, UCLA, Los Angeles, California 90095-1565, USA*

(Dated: October 13, 2008)

A rigorous theory for the generation of a large-scale magnetic field by random nonhelically forced motions of a conducting fluid combined with a linear shear is presented in the analytically tractable limit of $Rm \ll Re \ll 1$. This is a minimal proof-of-concept calculation aiming to put the shear dynamo, a new effect recently reported in a number of numerical experiments, on a firm physical and analytical footing. Numerically observed scalings of the wavenumber and growth rate of the fastest growing mode, previously not understood, are derived analytically. The simplicity of the model suggests that shear dynamo may be a generic property of shear flows — with ubiquitous relevance to astrophysical systems.

PACS numbers: 47.27.W-, 47.65.Md, 52.30.Cv, 95.30.Qd

Introduction. The magnetogenesis, or origin of cosmic magnetism, is one of the fundamental problems in theoretical astrophysics. It has long been believed that the magnetic fields observed in most astrophysical bodies owe their existence to the dynamo effect associated with the turbulence of the constituent plasmas. It is not controversial that turbulence of a conducting fluid amplifies magnetic fluctuations at scales comparable to or smaller than the scale of the motions. Small-scale magnetic fluctuations are indeed observed ubiquitously, but in most astrophysical systems, one also finds magnetic fields coherent on scales substantially larger than the scale of the turbulence (e.g., [1]). Generation of such fields, or mean-field dynamo, is expected to require a combined action of turbulence and some large-scale-coherent feature. One well-established such additional ingredient is net helicity (or, more generally, mirror-non-invariance) of the motion. The presence of helicity engenders growth of large-scale (“mean”) magnetic field, known as the α effect. While deriving the α effect analytically for realistic turbulent systems requires rather drastic closure assumptions, which usually cannot be justified rigorously, it is at least certain that the effect exists in certain physically meaningful and rigorously treatable limits: for example, in chaotic flows of a conducting fluid at low Rm [2, 3]. The combination of such proof-of-concept analytical results, intuitive explanations of how the effect works [4] and a body of numerical evidence [5, 6] has helped build a case for the α effect as a real physical phenomenon.

It has been suggested [7, 8, 9] that even in the absence of helicity, mean-field dynamo is possible if a large-scale velocity shear is present. The importance of such a possibility can hardly be overestimated, as shear is a ubiquitous feature in astrophysics (usually associated with differential rotation). A recent numerical study [10] showed

that shear dynamo does exist. However, its nature has remained poorly understood. The uncertainty is increased by the fact that, while the original derivation of the effect relied on a quantitative outcome of a closure calculation [7], the effect proved difficult to identify unambiguously by numerical computation of the mean-field-theory coefficients [11] and appeared to go away in rigorously solvable limits: the white-noise-velocity model and low- Rm mean-field magnetohydrodynamics [3, 12, 13] (although there has been some disagreement on whether shear dynamo is possible for $Rm \ll Re \ll 1$ [13, 14]).

In this Letter our aim is a minimal proof-of-concept calculation that would put the shear dynamo effect on a firm physical footing akin to that enjoyed by the α effect. We propose a very simple mean-field theory that rigorously predicts a large-scale dynamo driven by randomly forced shearing waves in the limit of $Rm \ll Re \ll 1$. The effect does not require any adjustable parameters. We also recover the scalings of the characteristic wavenumber and growth rate of the fastest-growing mode that were observed in a number of numerical studies [10, 15] but have not so far been explained analytically.

Shearing Waves. First let us introduce a model velocity field that will be used to obtain a dynamo. Consider an incompressible fluid with an imposed background linear shear, $\mathbf{U} = Sx\hat{\mathbf{y}}$, and assume that the magnetic field is dynamically weak, so the Lorentz force is negligible. Then the velocity deviation from $\mathbf{U}$ satisfies

$$\partial_t \mathbf{u} + Sx\partial_y \mathbf{u} + S\mathbf{u}_x \hat{\mathbf{y}} + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u} = -\nabla p + \nu \nabla^2 \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{f}, \quad (1)$$

where p is pressure determined from incompressibility $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} = 0$, ν is viscosity and $\mathbf{f}$ is a random body force, which is assumed to have a characteristic scale l_f .

Let us now make two simplifying assumptions. First, let $Re \sim ul_f/\nu \ll 1$, so we can neglect the nonlinear

term in Eq. (1). Second, let $\partial_z \mathbf{u} = 0$ and $\partial_z \mathbf{f} = 0$, i.e., consider a “quasi-2D” velocity, which has all three vector components but no z dependence. This velocity will help make analytical calculations particularly transparent, while, as indicated by numerical experiments [16], it is a favorable but not a uniquely special case vis-à-vis its dynamo properties. Since now $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}^\perp = 0$, the xy -plane velocity has a stream function: $\mathbf{u}^\perp = \hat{\mathbf{z}} \times \nabla \Phi$. Similarly, $\mathbf{f}^\perp = \hat{\mathbf{z}} \times \nabla F$. We seek the solutions of the (linearized) Eq. (1) as superpositions of “shearing waves” [17]:

$$\Phi = \sum_{\mathbf{k}_0} \Phi_{\mathbf{k}_0}(t) e^{i\mathbf{k}(t) \cdot \mathbf{r}}, \quad u_z = \sum_{\mathbf{k}_0} u_{z\mathbf{k}_0}(t) e^{i\mathbf{k}(t) \cdot \mathbf{r}}, \quad (2)$$

where $\mathbf{k}_0 = (k_{x0}, k_y, 0)$, $\mathbf{k}(t) = (k_{x0} - Sk_y t, k_y, 0)$. Then the amplitudes of the shearing waves satisfy

$$\partial_t [k^2(t) \Phi_{\mathbf{k}_0}] = -\nu k^4(t) \Phi_{\mathbf{k}_0} + k^2(t) F_{\mathbf{k}_0}, \quad (3)$$

$$\partial_t u_{z\mathbf{k}_0} = -\nu k^2(t) u_{z\mathbf{k}_0} + f_{z\mathbf{k}_0}. \quad (4)$$

Eq. (3) was obtained by taking $\hat{\mathbf{z}} \cdot [\nabla \times \text{Eq. (1)}]$. Eqs. (3) and (4) have explicit solutions

$$\Phi_{\mathbf{k}_0}(t) = \int_0^t dt' G_\nu(t, t') \frac{k^2(t')}{k^2(t)} F_{\mathbf{k}_0}(t'), \quad (5)$$

$$u_{z\mathbf{k}_0}(t) = \int_0^t dt' G_\nu(t, t') f_{z\mathbf{k}_0}(t'), \quad (6)$$

where $G_\nu(t, t') = \exp \left[-\nu \int_{t'}^t dt'' k^2(t'') \right]$.

Random Forcing and the Velocity Correlators. In the above, we assumed that the body force can be decomposed into shearing waves similarly to the velocity field, a convenient modeling choice and a standard approach in spectral shearing-box simulations [10]. However, physically, we want to model energy injection occurring at some specified characteristic scales (wavenumbers) in the laboratory frame, not in the shearing frame where wavenumbers depend on time. To implement this, we choose the body force to be a Gaussian random field with

$$\langle F_{\mathbf{k}_0}(t) F_{\mathbf{k}_0}^*(t') \rangle = [A_\perp / k^2(t)] \Delta_{\mathbf{k}_0}(t) \delta(t - t'), \quad (7)$$

$$\langle f_{z\mathbf{k}_0}(t) f_{z\mathbf{k}_0}^*(t') \rangle = A_z \Delta_{\mathbf{k}_0}(t) \delta(t - t'), \quad (8)$$

where $\Delta_{\mathbf{k}_0}(t) = H(k_{xf} - |k_x(t)|) \delta_{|k_y|, k_{yf}}$ fixes the forcing wavenumber $k_{yf} = 2\pi/l_f$ in the y direction and, via the Heaviside function H , sets the maximum wavenumber k_{xf} in the x direction. This model is chosen for its simplicity; in general, $\Delta_{\mathbf{k}_0}(t)$ can be arranged to give the forcing any desired spectrum (e.g., a spherical shell in the wavenumber space [10]).

A white-in-time in time forcing is a popular choice in turbulence modeling [5, 10] because the amplitude of such a forcing can be directly related to the mean power injected into the system per unit volume: denoting $\varepsilon = \langle \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{f} \rangle$ and assuming for simplicity that the same power is injected into each velocity component, it is easy

to show that $A_\perp = 2A_z = (2\pi/L_x k_{xf}) \varepsilon / 3$, where L_x is the system size. Note that the white-noise forcing model is not particularly restrictive because the resulting velocity [Eqs. (5) and (6)] does have a finite correlation time τ_c , in our case determined by viscosity, $\tau_c \sim l_f^2/\nu$ (in a more general case when Re is not small, the velocity correlation time is set by the nonlinear terms, so $\tau_c \sim l_f/u_{\text{rms}}$ is the typical turnover time of the turbulence; nonrigorously, this case is included in our consideration if the viscosity is replaced by turbulent viscosity, $\nu \sim u_{\text{rms}} l_f$). We shall see that, unlike in the case of other solvable dynamos [3, 18], it will be essential for the shear dynamo that the velocity correlation time is not zero.

Using Eqs. (5-8), the velocity correlators are

$$\langle |\Phi_{\mathbf{k}_0}(t)|^2 \rangle = A_\perp \int_0^t dt' [G_\nu(t, t')]^2 \frac{k^2(t')}{k^4(t)} \Delta_{\mathbf{k}_0}(t'), \quad (9)$$

$$\langle |u_{z\mathbf{k}_0}(t)|^2 \rangle = A_z \int_0^t dt' [G_\nu(t, t')]^2 \Delta_{\mathbf{k}_0}(t'), \quad (10)$$

while for two-point correlators with $t > t'$, we have

$$\langle \Phi_{\mathbf{k}_0}(t) \Phi_{\mathbf{k}_0}^*(t') \rangle = \delta_{\mathbf{k}_0, \mathbf{k}_0'} G_\nu(t, t') \frac{k^2(t')}{k^2(t)} \langle |\Phi_{\mathbf{k}_0}(t')|^2 \rangle, \quad (11)$$

$$\langle u_{z\mathbf{k}_0}(t) u_{z\mathbf{k}_0}^*(t') \rangle = \delta_{\mathbf{k}_0, \mathbf{k}_0'} G_\nu(t, t') \langle |u_{z\mathbf{k}_0}(t')|^2 \rangle. \quad (12)$$

Note that the mean helicity of our velocity field is $\langle \mathbf{u} \cdot [\nabla \times \mathbf{u}] \rangle = -2 \sum_{\mathbf{k}_0} k^2(t) \langle u_{z\mathbf{k}_0} \Phi_{\mathbf{k}_0}^* \rangle$. We can ensure that it is zero by stipulating $\langle f_{z\mathbf{k}_0}(t) F_{\mathbf{k}_0}^*(t') \rangle = 0$. This removes the possibility of the α effect.

Mean-Field Theory. The evolution equation for the magnetic field $\mathbf{B}$ in the presence of linear shear is

$$\partial_t \mathbf{B} + Sx \partial_y \mathbf{B} + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{B} = \mathbf{B} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u} + SB_x \hat{\mathbf{y}} + \eta \nabla^2 \mathbf{B}, \quad (13)$$

where η is the magnetic diffusivity. Since the velocity field is independent of z , we can separate the dependence of $\mathbf{B}$ on z by expanding it into Fourier modes, $\mathbf{B} = \sum_{k_z} \mathbf{B}(k_z) e^{ik_z z}$. Furthermore, only the projection $\mathbf{B}^\perp$ onto xy -plane needs to be calculated because $B_z = (i/k_z) \nabla \cdot \mathbf{B}^\perp$. For each k_z , $\mathbf{B}^\perp$ will satisfy a closed equation with k_z entering as a parameter and no mode coupling in k_z . We now seek the solutions of this equation again in the form of superposition of shearing waves, $\mathbf{B}^\perp = \sum_{\mathbf{k}_0} \mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{k}_0}^\perp(t) e^{i\mathbf{k}(t) \cdot \mathbf{r}}$, where the perpendicular wave numbers $\mathbf{k}_0$ and $\mathbf{k}(t)$ are defined in the same way as in the velocity decomposition [Eq. (2)]. $\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{k}_0}^\perp$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{k}_0}^\perp &= SB_{x\mathbf{k}_0} \hat{\mathbf{y}} - \eta [k^2(t) + k_z^2] \mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{k}_0}^\perp \\ &+ \sum_{\mathbf{k}_0'} \Phi_{\mathbf{k}_0'} [\hat{\mathbf{z}} \times \mathbf{k}'(t)] \cdot [\mathbf{k}(t) \hat{\mathbf{I}} - \hat{\mathbf{I}} \mathbf{k}'(t)] \cdot \mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{k}_0 - \mathbf{k}_0'}^\perp \\ &- ik_z \sum_{\mathbf{k}_0'} u_{z\mathbf{k}_0'} \mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{k}_0 - \mathbf{k}_0'}^\perp, \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{I}}$ is a unit dyadic. We can separate the large-scale field by considering the $\mathbf{k}_0 = 0$ component of Eq. (14):

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \mathbf{B}_0 &= S B_{x0} \hat{\mathbf{y}} - \eta k_z^2 \mathbf{B}_0 - i k_z \sum_{\mathbf{k}_0} u_{z\mathbf{k}_0} \mathbf{B}_{-\mathbf{k}_0}^\perp \\ &\quad - \sum_{\mathbf{k}_0} \Phi_{\mathbf{k}_0} [\hat{\mathbf{z}} \times \mathbf{k}(t)] \mathbf{k}(t) \cdot \mathbf{B}_{-\mathbf{k}_0}^\perp \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

(note that $B_{z0} = 0$ because $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{B}_0 = i k_z B_{z0} = 0$).

We now calculate $\mathbf{B}_{-\mathbf{k}_0}^\perp$ in Eq. (15) in terms of $\mathbf{B}_0$ via Eq. (14). This is particularly easy in the limit $\text{Rm} \ll \text{Re} \ll 1$ and $S(l_f/u_{\text{rms}})\text{Rm} \ll 1$, where $\text{Rm} \sim u_{\text{rms}} l_f / \eta$. Then $\eta k^2 \gg k^2 \Phi$, νk^2 , S and $|\mathbf{B}_0| \gg |\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{k}_0}^\perp|$, so the dominant terms in Eq. (14) are $\eta k^2(t) \mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{k}_0}^\perp$ and the $\mathbf{k}' = \mathbf{k}$ components of the wavenumber sums. Then

$$\mathbf{B}_{-\mathbf{k}_0}^\perp = -\frac{i k_z u_{z\mathbf{k}_0}^* \mathbf{B}_0 + \Phi_{\mathbf{k}_0}^* [\hat{\mathbf{z}} \times \mathbf{k}(t)] \mathbf{k}(t) \cdot \mathbf{B}_0}{\eta [k^2(t) + k_z^2]}. \quad (16)$$

Substituting this into Eq. (15), we get

$$\partial_t \mathbf{B}_0 = S B_{x0} \hat{\mathbf{y}} - [\eta + \beta(t)] k_z^2 \mathbf{B}_0 + i k_z \hat{\mathbf{z}} \times \hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(t) \cdot \mathbf{B}_0, \quad (17)$$

where $\beta(t) = \sum_{\mathbf{k}_0} |u_{z\mathbf{k}_0}(t)|^2 / \eta [k^2(t) + k_z^2] \ll \eta$ (negligible “turbulent diffusivity” in the limit of low Rm) and

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(t) = \sum_{\mathbf{k}_0} \frac{u_{z\mathbf{k}_0}(t) \Phi_{\mathbf{k}_0}(t) + u_{z\mathbf{k}_0}^*(t) \Phi_{\mathbf{k}_0}^*(t)}{\eta [k^2(t) + k_z^2]} \mathbf{k}(t) \mathbf{k}(t). \quad (18)$$

This can be viewed as a tensor generalization of a familiar α term [2] but Eq. (17) is still a stochastic equation: $\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(t)$ fluctuates with the correlation time τ_c of the velocity field and $\langle \hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \rangle = 0$ (cf. [11, 14, 19]).

Averaging Eq. (17) (with respect to forcing realizations), assuming additionally that $S\tau_c \ll 1$, $\eta k_z^2 \tau_c \ll 1$, and using the standard iterative expansion [20] to calculate $\langle \hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(t) \cdot \mathbf{B}_0(t) \rangle$, we find the equation for $\bar{\mathbf{B}} = \langle \mathbf{B}_0 \rangle$:

$$\partial_t \bar{\mathbf{B}} = [S \hat{\mathbf{y}} \hat{x} - \eta k_z^2 \hat{\mathbf{I}} - k_z^2 \hat{\mathbf{D}}] \cdot \bar{\mathbf{B}}, \quad (19)$$

where the term originating from $\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ now looks more like a tensor diffusivity (although not sign-definite):

$$\hat{\mathbf{D}} = \int_0^t dt' \langle [\hat{\mathbf{z}} \times \hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(t)] \cdot [\hat{\mathbf{z}} \times \hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(t')] \rangle, \quad (20)$$

where $St \ll 1$, but $t \gg \tau_c$. Substituting for $\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ from Eq. (18), using the fact that u_z and Φ are Gaussian and uncorrelated with each other (so there is no mean helicity), and employing Eqs. (11) and (12), we find

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathbf{D}} &= 4 \sum_{\mathbf{k}_0} \int_0^t dt' \hat{\mathbf{K}}(t, t') [G_\nu(t, t')]^2 \frac{k^2(t')}{k^2(t)} \\ &\quad \times \frac{\langle |u_{z\mathbf{k}_0}(t')|^2 \rangle \langle |\Phi_{\mathbf{k}_0}(t')|^2 \rangle}{\eta^2 [k^2(t) + k_z^2] [k^2(t') + k_z^2]}, \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{K}}(t, t') = [\hat{\mathbf{z}} \times \mathbf{k}(t)] \mathbf{k}(t) \cdot [\hat{\mathbf{z}} \times \mathbf{k}(t')] \mathbf{k}(t')$. Without shear, $\mathbf{k}(t) = \mathbf{k}(t')$ and $\hat{\mathbf{K}}(t, t') = 0$. In the presence of shear, the wave vectors evolve and we get

$$\hat{\mathbf{K}}(t, t') = (t - t') S k_y^2 \begin{bmatrix} -k_y k_x(t') & -k_y^2 \\ k_x(t) k_x(t') & k_y k_x(t) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (22)$$

All matrix elements of $\hat{\mathbf{D}}$ are small compared with other coefficients in Eq. (19) and only D_{xy} need be kept because there are no other contributions to the xy matrix element in Eq. (19). Eq. (19) now takes the following form

$$\partial_t \bar{\mathbf{B}} = \begin{bmatrix} -\eta k_z^2 & -k_z^2 D_{xy} \\ S & -\eta k_z^2 \end{bmatrix} \cdot \bar{\mathbf{B}} \quad (23)$$

Since $\hat{\mathbf{K}}(t, t) = 0$, it is manifest in Eqs. (21) and (22) that $\hat{\mathbf{D}} \neq 0$ only if the velocity field has a non-zero correlation time (cf. [7, 14]). Since we are working in the limit $S\tau_c \ll 1$, the time correlation function of the velocity is $G_\nu(t, t') \approx \exp[-\nu k^2(t)(t - t')]$ and we have

$$D_{xy} \approx -S \sum_{\mathbf{k}_0} k_y^4 \frac{\langle |u_{z\mathbf{k}_0}(t)|^2 \rangle \langle |\Phi_{\mathbf{k}_0}(t)|^2 \rangle}{\eta^2 \nu^2 k^8(t)}. \quad (24)$$

Since $D_{xy}S < 0$ is unambiguously sign-definite, there is a positive feedback in the dynamo loop in Eq. (23). The growth rate is $\gamma = k_z |D_{xy}S|^{1/2} - \eta k_z^2$. The wavenumber and the growth rate of the fastest-growing mode are

$$k_z^{\text{peak}} = \frac{\sqrt{|D_{xy}S|}}{2\eta}, \quad \gamma_{\text{max}} = \frac{|D_{xy}S|}{4\eta}. \quad (25)$$

Dependence on Shear. How k_z^{peak} and γ_{max} depend on S is a key (numerically) measurable parameter dependence and we should be able to predict it if we are to claim that our model calculation contains some universal features. The evidence so far has contradicted theory: mean-field theories [7, 14] predict $k_z^{\text{peak}} \propto S$, $\gamma_{\text{max}} \propto S^2$, while numerical simulations in various contexts [10, 15] report $k_z^{\text{peak}} \propto S^{1/2}$, $\gamma_{\text{max}} \propto S$.

Let us substitute into Eq. (24) the velocity spectra [Eqs. (9) and (10)] of the shearing waves excited by our model forcing [Eqs. (7) and (8)]. We get

$$D_{xy} \approx -\frac{1}{9} S \text{Pm}^2 \varepsilon^2 \tau_c^4 k_{yf}^2 \frac{2\pi}{L_x k_{xf}} I, \quad (26)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} I &= \frac{1}{\xi_f} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \frac{d\xi}{(1 + \xi^2)^5} \\ &\quad \times \left[\int_0^t d\tau e^{-2\tau(1 + \xi^2)/\tau_c} H(\xi_f - |\xi + S\tau|) \right]^2. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

To obtain this formula, we summed over k_y , used the fact that the integrand in Eq. (24) is even in $\mathbf{k}_0$, replaced $\sum_{\mathbf{k}_{x0}} = (L_x/2\pi) \int dk_{x0}$, changed the integration variables to $\xi = (k_{x0} - S k_{yf} t) / k_{yf}$ and $\tau = t - t'$, denoted

$\xi_f = k_{xf}/k_{yf}$, $\tau_c = 1/\nu k_{yf}^2$, and $\text{Pm} = \nu/\eta \ll 1$. We assume $S > 0$; if $S < 0$, change $k_y \rightarrow -k_y$ inside in the wavenumber integral in Eq. (24).

It is not hard to see that D_{xy} is largest for small values of k_{xf} , i.e., shearing waves forced in a narrow band in $k_x(t)$ are particularly effective in amplifying the magnetic field [22]. So let us take $k_{xf} = 2\pi/L_x$ (the smallest possible) and $\xi_f = k_{xf}/k_{yf} \ll 1$. In this limit the integral (27) is easy to calculate: $I = (\tau_c^2/2) [1 - (S\tau_c/4\xi_f)(1 - e^{-4\xi_f/S\tau_c})]$. This formula encodes the fact that D_{xy} depends crucially on the widths of the velocity correlation function and of the spectrum of the shearing waves: the Heaviside function in Eq. (27), taken as a function of τ , has the width ξ_f/S , which is to be compared with τ_c .

If $S\tau_c \ll \xi_f \ll 1$ (“weak shear”), we have $I \approx \tau_c^2/2$, whence $D_{xy} \approx S\text{Pm}^2 u_{\text{rms}}^4 \tau_c^4 k_{yf}^2/18$, where $u_{\text{rms}}^2 = \varepsilon\tau_c$ (this is clear dimensionally and also easy to show quantitatively for $\xi_f \ll 1$). Substituting into Eq. (25) gives

$$k_z^{\text{peak}} \approx S\tau_c \frac{\text{Rm}^2}{6\sqrt{2}} k_{yf}, \quad \gamma_{\text{max}} \approx S^2\tau_c \frac{\text{Rm}^3\text{Re}}{72}, \quad (28)$$

where $\text{Re} = u_{\text{rms}}/\nu k_{yf}$, $\text{Rm} = u_{\text{rms}}/\nu k_{yf}$. These are the previously predicted scalings [7, 14].

In the opposite limit, $\xi_f \ll S\tau_c \ll 1$ (“not-so-weak shear”), we have $I \approx \tau_c \xi_f/S$. This gives $D_{xy} \approx \text{Pm}^2 u_{\text{rms}}^4 \tau_c^3 k_{yf} (2\pi/L_x)/9$ and, therefore,

$$k_z^{\text{peak}} \approx \sqrt{S\tau_c} \frac{\text{Rm}^2}{6} \sqrt{\frac{2\pi k_{yf}}{L_x}}, \quad \gamma_{\text{max}} \approx S \frac{\text{Rm}^3\text{Re}}{36} \frac{2\pi}{L_x k_{yf}}. \quad (29)$$

Such scalings, $k_z^{\text{peak}} \propto S^{1/2}$ and $\gamma_{\text{max}} \propto S$, have been reported in several recent numerical experiments [10, 15]. While it is encouraging that they can be recovered analytically, one should keep in mind that most of these simulations were not done in the asymptotic regime $\text{Rm} \ll \text{Re} \ll 1$ or at particularly small $S\tau_c$. The import of our derivation is in demonstrating that the scalings depend on how strong the shear is and whether the velocity field decorrelates faster or slower than it takes the shearing waves to transit the wavenumber band (in the laboratory frame) where they are forced.

Note that the system size L_x enters explicitly in Eq. (26) and in Eq. (29) [in Eq. (28), it disappeared because we maximized the dynamo by taking $k_{xf} = 2\pi/L_x$]. This dependence has to do with the fraction of the energy injected by forcing that goes into the wavenumbers that contribute dominantly to the dynamo. In numerical experiments, increasing L_x does indeed lead to γ_{max} initially decreasing, but at large L_x it appears to stabilize at a constant value [16], a feature not captured by our theory. These simulations, however, had $\text{Rm} = \text{Re} \gtrsim 1$, so the nonlinear mode coupling was nonnegligible there and the relation between the forcing and the velocity spectra less direct than in our calculation. In (astro)physically

interesting systems, the approximation of linear shear is only valid at scales smaller than the characteristic system scale, which is rarely much larger than the turbulence scale, so, realistically, $2\pi/L_x k_{yf}$ is never very small.

Conclusion. We have presented what we think is the minimal analytically tractable model of the shear dynamo. The simplicity of the model suggests that the effect is robust, while its rigorous validity in the assumed limits ($\text{Rm} \ll \text{Re} \ll 1$, $S\tau_c \ll 1$) suggests that it is physical. Much remains to be understood before it can be assessed whether the shear dynamo offers a panacea for (nonhelical) generation of large-scale magnetic fields in astrophysical systems. A further effort in this direction appears worthwhile in view of the great success recently enjoyed by shear-induced dynamos in astrophysically motivated numerical experiments and a basic similarity of the field structure that they generate [10, 15, 21].

We acknowledge important discussions with A. Brandenburg, S. Cowley, F. Rincon and G. Rüdiger and support by STFC (A.A.S., T.H., G.L., T.A.Y.), Newton Trust (T.H.), Nuffield Foundation (A.M.), and the Leverhulme Trust Network for Magnetized Plasma Turbulence.

* Electronic address: a.schekochihin@imperial.ac.uk; address after 1 January 2009: Rudolf Peierls Centre for Theoretical Physics, University of Oxford, Oxford OX1 3NP, UK.

- [1] A. Shukurov (2004), astro-ph/0411739.
- [2] M. Steenbeck, F. Krause, and K.-H. Rädler, *Z. Naturforsch.* **21a**, 369 (1966); H. K. Moffatt, *Magnetic Field Generation in Electrically Conducting Fluids* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1978).
- [3] K.-H. Rädler and M. Rheinhardt, *Geophys. Astrophys. Fluid Dyn.* **101**, 117 (2007).
- [4] E. N. Parker, *Astrophys. J.* **122**, 293 (1955).
- [5] A. Brandenburg, *Astrophys. J.* **550**, 824 (2001).
- [6] A. Brandenburg et al. (2008), arXiv:0805.1287.
- [7] I. Rogachevskii and N. Kleeorin, *Phys. Rev. E* **68**, 036301 (2003).
- [8] V. Urpin, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **308**, 741 (1999).
- [9] E. G. Blackman, *Astrophys. J.* **496**, L17 (1998).
- [10] T. A. Yousef et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100**, 184501 (2008); *Astron. Nachr.* **329**, 737 (2008).
- [11] A. Brandenburg et al., *Astrophys. J.* **676**, 740 (2008).
- [12] G. Rüdiger and L. L. Kichatinov, *Astron. Nachr.* **327**, 298 (2006).
- [13] L. L. Kichatinov, *Astron. Nachr.* **329**, 722 (2008).
- [14] I. Rogachevskii and N. Kleeorin, *Astron. Nachr.* **329**, 732 (2008).
- [15] P. J. Käpylä et al. (2008), arXiv:0806.0375; D. W. Hughes and M. R. E. Proctor (2008), arXiv:0810.1586.
- [16] A. Mallet and T. A. Yousef (2008), unpublished.
- [17] Lord Kelvin, *Phil. Mag.* **24**, 188 (1887).
- [18] A. P. Kazantsev, *Sov. Phys. JETP* **26**, 1031 (1968).
- [19] E. T. Vishniac and A. Brandenburg, *Astrophys. J.* **475**, 263 (1997); N. A. Silant'ev, *Astron. Astrophys.* **364**, 339 (2000); M. R. E. Proctor, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **382**,

- L39 (2007).
- [20] N. G. van Kampen, *Physica* **74**, 239 (1974).
- [21] F. Rincon et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**, 254502 (2007);
O. Gressel et al., *Astron. Astrophys.* **483**, L25 (2008).
G. Lesur and G. I. Ogilvie, *Astron. Astrophys.* **488**, 451
(2008).
- [22] This can be shown to remain true if shearing waves are forced in a wavenumber band with $k_x(t)$ away from zero.